



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,218	03/09/2004	Aaron L. Eggemeyer	7784-000979	2708
27572	7590	12/21/2007		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			EXAMINER CHAMBERS, TROY	
			ART UNIT 3641	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/796,218		EGGEMEYER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Troy Chambers		3641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 13-24 in the reply filed on 05/07/2007 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 1-12 and 25-37 have been ordered cancelled by the applicant and should be indicated as such in the listing of claims (Refer to Response to Election/Restriction Requirement dated May 7, 2007).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 13, 17-19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admissions in view of US 6755372 issued to Menzel and in further view of the EDO 3000 series Rugged Laptop and docking station disclosed in the tsiot.com website. Applicant's background admits there is known a mobile platform including an attachment point for a weapon, data management systems and data links. The admission does not disclose a mobile platform including a docking station, a computer carried on the mobile platform or a docking port.

Menzel discloses a computer 34 on board a P-3 Orion (col. 3, ll. 59-61). The computer has a processor 50, user interface 52, database 54 and an operating system. The computer interfaces with a Harpoon Block II missile package 40 via an Mk-82 line. At the time of the invention, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide the prior art admission with the computer interface 34 of Menzel so that the computer could interface with the weapons system and avoid an expensive upgrade. A computer with components that comply with military standards is inherent.

The EDO series laptop disclosed in the tsoit.com document discloses the computer, docking station and a mount for vehicles. At the time of the invention, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide the EDO computer and its components to the combined device of the admitted prior art and Menzel for the purpose of providing a rugged, versatile and mobile workstation.

6. Claims 14-16 and 20 were rejected under the Examiner's taking of Official Notice and not challenged by the applicant. Therefore, those claims remain rejected as known

in the art and obvious in view of the combination of the admitted prior art, Menzel and the EDO laptop computer as discussed above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/18/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's claim does not make clear what is a military specification bus and a non-military specification bus. For example, applicant has not pointed out that any of the prior art references pointed out by the examiner has a bus that does not comply with military specifications. Moreover, applicant has not specified any particular military specification. This is similar to claiming a "military vehicle." What is a "military vehicle" and why is it any different than any other vehicle. However, if one claimed HMMWV, then there may be an argument for patentability. Additionally, the applicant's admission and Menzel relate to systems for military operations, vehicles and weapons so it would be, at the least, inherent that such systems include components that comply with military specifications.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Troy Chambers whose telephone number is 571-272-6874 and whose email address is troy.chambers@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael J. Carone, can be reached on 571-272-6873. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Troy Chambers/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3641

/T. C./

12/11/2007

Application/Control Number: 10/796,218
Art Unit: 3641

Page 6